NPSEN-BP 2 April 1965

MEMO FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Skagit Flood Control Improvements

- 1. On the evening of 29 March, Colonel Holbrook and I attended an evening meeting which included an assemblage of 42 persons interested in flood control improvements in the Skagit River basin. A list of persons attending the meeting is attached hereto. Colonel Holbrook described the general planning for the Skagit River basin and referred to the Skagit River report on levee and channel improvement now under review by the Division Engineer. He also outlined general aspects of proposed future studies in the Skagit River basin. He emphasized the necessity for local cooperation support. I presented additional details of planning on our proposed studies of the Nookachamp Creek area. Following these presentations, there was a question and answer period. The following representative inquiries were discussed:
- 1. Question: If you levee off the Nookachamp Creek Area, how can you be assured that it will be available when we require it in a flood emergency?

Answer: The right to flood would be made a legal part of the agreement turning over the project to local interests to operate. The right to flood this type of project has been utilized many times in flood control projects of the Mississippi River.

2. Question: Diking District 1 is already constructing many of the improvements recommended in the Corps plan. Can they be reimbursed for this effort?

Answer: Reimbursement for work done prior to project authorization is not possible. There are many instances where the Corps has had to reject local interest claims for this kind of work.

3. Question: Diking District 1, the State and County are insisting on higher standards than shown in the Corps plan. That is, top widths of levees are 12 to 14 feet and side slopes are 3 on 1 instead of 2 on 1. Why is this necessary?

Answer: This may be in part because the soils being used in the present construction are less stable than those used in the Corps plan. In the present instance, we would say that the Corps standards are minimum ones and that we will give consideration to increasing the sections at the time final project planning is undertaken.

4. Question: In the Nookachamp Creek area, what provision would be made for taking care of the runoff from Nookachamp Creek?

Answer: Flood control gates, and a pumping station would be studied in connection with handling of the interior drainage for the Nookachamp Creek area.

5. Question: What about flood control for the areas upstream of Sedro Woolley?

Answer: This will be thoroughly examined in the next phase of our project studies, with full consideration of upstream storage as well as flood problems above Sedro Woolley.

6. Question: Why does the Corps propose channel improvements in the lower river? This can ruin the fishing and require taking of many farm buildings.

Answer: In final design, consideration will be given to both channel improvement and additional levee construction. Final design will be dependent on more detail survey studies that were made in the planning work.

7. Question: Will the Avon Bypass be necessary as a condition for the construction of levees in lower river?

Answer: We are not certain about conditions that our higher authority will place on construction and improvement of the levees. We know that they are reluctant to authorize projects which in themselves have only a low degree of flood control improvement.

2. In concluding the discussion, Mr. George Dynes made a general statement that citizens of the area should refrain from making premature judgments on the feasibility of any aspect of flood control planning until the Corps has had a full opportunity to complete its engineering studies. He directed his remarks principally to opponents of the Avon Bypass. He strongly advised against prejudging the project and against trying to discourage completion of the engineering studies which will determine final alinement and costs of the Bypass. The meeting was very cordial and, in general, indicated strong support for the Corps flood control planning efforts.

1 Incl List of attendees GEDNEY THE

cc: District Engr thru C, Engr Div Skrinde BP desk file Name

Address

Hanson Cal Holbrook Robert Gedney Hoyd Johnson;

Hernan James Lawry Buff Se Walker

gill & return co, M. Dynes

fromth Schill

Melvin Stakkeland Benham

Boy E. Ondal v.

Programmed

Shillender

Monica & Shane

Server Harring

Shirt Harring

Shirt Harring

Winter allson

Mendel Leande 3.
Norman Stableburd
Curtis Munter

F.C. Citondal so In Kuthera

E japlan

rigille 1/x elson to Kudy Liander

106 FIGET S.V. Mount Vernon, icast. Corps of Engineers

Mount Verner 13#3

Mount Virnow Rt 6 surver as By Bay 246, Mt. Verus 356 Steeling St. Ledus Hotels Mount Veter -

PHY mtlernan Pot 4 Int Verna

Pt. dy gut Jernon Rto 1 Bow was

Edean They try 102

R# 1 Bealing to Wash. Sty to net l'errore d'ay Bt3 This vertion

18th my weren not Vernon

Itale nutlemen met Vernos

Route 4 Mt Vernon 12 16 G Mt Yernon

Pte 1 6x263 Noute 1 Bow Hand 1. reh 29,1965

Representing

SKART CO Dike District #1

Skegit County Pifet 2.

May 8 12

Dike #12 Like Kest # 20

- skoper proporation

Day Valley forms

Deten put 21 Defro Dest # 19

Detry Jan 6 7 19 4 17 Drawing List 4 17 Wirmaige West # 14 Beter # 1

Dike Dist 1

DIKE 17157. 15 Dike Dist 21

1711 KP 2151 21

my Vernon El of Commi

Drawage Dist # 21 Dike Dist 17 Bike 11 17

Manage

Celesalle unge 5 Dite 18

ecy x rke vist # 13